

Facility name:	<u>Pasco Sanitary Landfill</u>		
Location:	<u>Pasco, Washington</u>		
EPA Region:	<u>10</u>		
Person(s) in charge of the facility:	<u>Larry Dietrich</u>		
Name of Reviewer:		<u>Lynn Guilford</u>	Date: <u>5/27/87</u>
General description of the facility:			
(For example: landfill, surface impoundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of the facility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed for rating; agency action, etc.)			
<p>Resource Recovery Corporation operated a portion of Pasco Sanitary Landfill as a hazardous waste disposal site from 1972 to 1974. Currently the disposal areas are all covered with three feet of soil. This cover gives both the surface water and direct contact routes scores of 0. The ground water route has an observed release and a large ground water population giving the site an overall score of 44.46</p>			
<p>Scores: <math>S_M = 44.46</math> (<math>S_{gw} = 76.92</math> <math>S_{sw} = 0</math> <math>S_a = 0</math>)</p> <p><math>S_{FE} = 0</math></p> <p><math>S_{DC} = 0</math></p>			

**FIGURE 1**  
**HRS COVER SHEET**

*[Signature]*  
7-16-87

USEPA SF



1452416

Ground Water Route Work Sheet						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
<b>1</b> Observed Release	0 <b>45</b>	1	45	45	3.1	
If observed release is given a score of 45, proceed to line <b>4</b> . If observed release is given a score of 0, proceed to line <b>2</b> .						
<b>2</b> Route Characteristics					3.2	
Depth to Aquifer of Concern	0 1 2 3	2		6		
Net Precipitation	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Permeability of the Unsaturated Zone	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Physical State	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Total Route Characteristics Score				15		
<b>3</b> Containment	0 1 2 3	1		3	3.3	
<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics					3.4	
Toxicity/Persistence	0 3 6 9 <b>12</b> 15 18	1	12	18		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 <b>8</b>	1	8	8		
Total Waste Characteristics Score			20	26		
<b>5</b> Targets					3.5	
Ground Water Use	0 1 2 <b>3</b>	3	9	9		
Distance to Nearest Well/Population Served	0 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 <b>40</b>	1	40	40		
Total Targets Score			49	49		
<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>			44100	57,330		
<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 57,330 and multiply by 100			S <sub>gw</sub> = 76.92			

**FIGURE 2  
GROUND WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET**

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87

Surface Water Route Work Sheet						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
<b>1</b> Observed Release	0                  45	1		45	4.1	
If observed release is given a value of 45, proceed to line <b>4</b> . If observed release is given a value of 0, proceed to line <b>2</b> .						
<b>2</b> Route Characteristics					4.2	
Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	1		3		
1-yr. 24-hr. Rainfall	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	1		3		
Distance to Nearest Surface Water	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	2		6		
Physical State	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	1		3		
Total Route Characteristics Score			0	15		
<b>3</b> Containment	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	1	0	3	4.3	
<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics					4.4	
Toxicity/Persistence	<input type="radio"/> 0 3 6 9 12 15 18	1	0	18		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1	0	8		
Total Waste Characteristics Score			0	26		
<b>5</b> Targets					4.5	
Surface Water Use	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	3	0	9		
Distance to a Sensitive Environment	<input type="radio"/> 0 1 2 3	2	0	6		
Population Served/Distance to Water Intake Downstream	<input type="radio"/> 0 4 6 8 10 12 16 18 20 24 30 32 35 40	1	0	40		
Total Targets Score			0	55		
<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>				64,350		
<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 64,350 and multiply by 100				S <sub>sw</sub> = 0		

**FIGURE 7**  
**SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORK SHEET**

*Handwritten Signature*  
7-17-87

Air Route Work Sheet						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Rel. (Section)	
<b>1</b> Observed Release	<b>0</b> 45	1	0	45	5.1	
Date and Location:						
Sampling Protocol:						
If line <b>1</b> is 0, the $S_a = 0$ . Enter on line <b>5</b> . If line <b>1</b> is 45, then proceed to line <b>2</b> .						
<b>2</b> Waste Characteristics					5.2	
Reactivity and Incompatibility	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Toxicity	0 1 2 3	3		9		
Hazardous Waste Quantity	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1		8		
Total Waste Characteristics Score				20		
<b>3</b> Targets					5.3	
Population Within 4-Mile Radius	0 9 12 15 18 21 24 27 30	1		30		
Distance to Sensitive Environment	0 1 2 3	2		6		
Land Use	0 1 2 3	1		3		
Total Targets Score				39		
<b>4</b> Multiply <b>1</b> x <b>2</b> x <b>3</b>				35,100		
<b>5</b> Divide line <b>4</b> by 35,100 and multiply by 100			$S_a = 0$			

**FIGURE 9**  
**AIR ROUTE WORK SHEET**

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
7-17-87

	s	s <sup>2</sup>
Groundwater Route Score (S <sub>gw</sub> )	76.92	5916.69
Surface Water Route Score (S <sub>sw</sub> )	0	0
Air Route Score (S <sub>a</sub> )	0	0
$S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2$		5916.69
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2}$		76.92
$\sqrt{S_{gw}^2 + S_{sw}^2 + S_a^2} / 1.73 = S_M =$		44.46

FIGURE 10  
WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING S<sub>M</sub>

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87



Direct Contact Work Sheet						
Rating Factor	Assigned Value (Circle One)	Multi- plier	Score	Max. Score	Ref. (Section)	
<b>1</b> Observed Incident	0      45	1		45	8.1	
If line <b>1</b> is 45, proceed to line <b>4</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, proceed to line <b>2</b>						
<b>2</b> Accessibility	0 <b>1</b> 2   3	1	1	3	8.2	
<b>3</b> Containment	<b>0</b> 15	1	0	15	8.3	
<b>4</b> Waste Characteristics Toxicity	<b>0</b> 1   2   3	5	0	15	8.4	
<b>5</b> Targets					8.5	
Population Within a 1-Mile Radius	<b>0</b> 1   2   3   4   5	4	0	20		
Distance to a Critical Habitat	<b>0</b> 1   2   3	4	0	12		
Total Targets Score			0	32		
<b>6</b> If line <b>1</b> is 45, multiply <b>1</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b> If line <b>1</b> is 0, multiply <b>2</b> x <b>3</b> x <b>4</b> x <b>5</b>			0	21,600		
<b>7</b> Divide line <b>6</b> by 21,600 and multiply by 100			SDC = 0			

**FIGURE 12  
DIRECT CONTACT WORK SHEET**

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87



## ecology and environment, inc.

101 YESLER WAY, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, 98104, TEL. 206/624-9537

International Specialists in the Environment

### DOCUMENTATION RECORDS

FOR

### HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

Instructions: The purpose of these records is to provide a convenient way to prepare an auditable record of the data and documentation used to apply the Hazard Ranking System to a given facility/site. As briefly as possible summarize the information you used to assign the score for each factor (e.g., "Waste Quantity = 4320 drums plus 800 cubic yards of sludges"). The source of the information should be provided for each entry and should be a biographical-type reference that will make the source used for the data point easier to find. Include the location of the source and consider appending a copy of the relevant page(s) for ease in review.

FACILITY NAME: Pasco Sanitary Landfill

LOCATION: Kahlotus Road and Highway 12  
Pasco, Washington 99301

REVIEWER: Lynn Guilford

TDD: TDD F10-8701-04

ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT, INC.

DATE: June 1987

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87



## GROUND WATER ROUTE

### 1. OBSERVED RELEASE

#### 1a. Contaminants Detected (5 maximum) in Ground Water

Tetrachloroethylene was found in monitoring well EE2.

Trichloroethylene was found in monitoring wells EE2, EE3, and JUB 2.

The levels found were significantly over background (JUB-CATR)

#### - Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

These compounds, tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene, were not found in background wells, but were only found in wells downgradient and adjacent to zone A and the old landfill burn and demolition disposal area. Paint wastes were disposed in Zone A.

HRS Section Score: 45 (Ref. 1 p50)

\*\*\*\*\*

### 2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

#### 2a. Depth to Aquifer of Concern

#### - Name and description of aquifer(s) of concern:

Water table aquifer, unconfined, which overlies Yakima Basalts. Groundwater occurs 38.5 to 68.7 feet below ground surface at site. See table 4.1 and figures 4.2 and 4.3 of Reference 1 for description of geologic units and cross-sections.

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

#### 2b. Net Precipitation

#### - Mean annual or seasonal precipitation (list months for seasonal):

#### - Mean annual lake evaporation rate (list months for seasonal):

#### - Net precipitation (subtract above figures):

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

*[Signature]*  
7-17-87

2c. Permeability of Unsaturated Zone

- Soil type in unsaturated zone:
- Permeability associated with soil type:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

2d. Physical State

- Physical state of substance at time of disposal (or at present time for generated gases):

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\* \* \* \* \*

3. CONTAINMENT

3a. Containment

- Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:
- Method with highest score:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\* \* \* \* \*

4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

4.a Toxicity and Persistence

- Compound(s) evaluated:

Compound	Toxicity	Persistence	Total
Trichloroethylene	2	2	12
Tetrachloroethylene	2	2	12

- Compound(s) with highest score:

Tetrachloroethylene and Trichloroethylene

HRS Section Score: 12 (Ref. 2)

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87

4b. Hazardous Waste Quantity

- Total amount of hazardous substance at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of zero. (Give a reasonable estimate, even if the quantity is above maximum.):

The total waste quantity is estimated to be approximately 47,000 drums.

- Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity (must be documented quantity and not assumed):

Paint Wastes - 26,426 drums  
2,4-D Mfg. wastes - 5,080 drums  
Carcinogenics - 9 drums  
Aromatic Tar - 1,159 drums  
Cadmium Waste - 11 drums

Pesticides - 425 drums  
Metal Finishing/Cleaning  
- 10,947 drums  
Solvents - 253 drums  
Barium with Mercury  
- 2,896 drums

HRS Section Score: 8 (Ref. 1,3,4,5)

\* \* \* \* \*

5. TARGETS

5a. Ground Water Use

- Use(s) of aquifer(s) of concern within a 3-mile radius of the facility:

Ground water is used for drinking water and irrigation within three miles of the site. Some of the wells used for drinking water are beyond the perimeter of the public water supply system.

HRS Section Score: 3 (Ref. 6,7,8,  
9,10,11,12,13)

5b. Distance to Nearest Well

- Location of nearest well drawing from the "aquifer of concern" or occupied building not served by a public water supply:

SW 1/4, NW 1/4, Section 22, Township 9N, Range 30E.

- Distance from site to above well or building:

The well is on site, approximately 800 feet north of monitoring wells EE2, EE3, and JUB 2, which are contaminated.

HRS Section Score: 4 (Ref. 11,13 )

*Handwritten signature and date:*  
7-17-87

5c. Population Served by Ground Water within a 3-Mile Radius

- Identify water supply well(s) drawing from the "aquifer of concern" within a 3-mile radius and populations served by each:

See sheet 4A

Total 1048

- Compute land area irrigated by supply well(s) drawing from the "aquifer of concern" and convert to population (1.5 people per acre):

See Sheets 4B,C,D

- Total population served by ground water:

$$1048 + 14820 = 15868$$

HRS Section Score: 40 (Ref. 7,8,9,  
10,11,12,13,14)

*Robert B. Bader*  
7-17-87

6/5/87

Pasco Sanitary Landfill

GW used for drinking water within 3 miles of above site

<u>Name</u>	<u>Pop. Served</u>	<u>Reference #</u>
1. Washington Idaho Laborers	3.8	7
2. Paul Savage	3.8	7
3. Al Yenney	3.8	7
4. Tom Kidwell	3.8	7
5. Van Wormer	3.8	7
6. Lakeview Mobile Home Park	800	8
7. Rada Sons	16	8
9. AZTLAN Construction Inc	20	8
10. BPA - Franklin	16	8
11. Bonnie Brae Trailer Court	65	8
12. De Vries Water System	12	8
13. Palmarez	3.8	10
14. Marquez	3.8	10
15. Johnson & Boxbaum	3.8	10
16. Bumgarner	3.8	10
17. Dall	3.8	10
18. Cunningham	3.8	10
19. Rasmussen	3.8	10
20. Western Farm Services	24	8
21. Frontier Machinery	50	8
Total	1048.6	

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87



Pasco Sanitary Landfill

6/10/87

EW used for irrigation within 3 miles of above site:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Reference #</u>
Burlington Northern	520	9
"	130	
Conn Mut Life Ins	145	
Burlington Northern	520	
"	520	
"	300	
Middleton	142	
"	20	
Columbia East	268	
Burlington Northern	137	
"	160	
"	400	
"	315	
"	107	
"	300	
"	200	
Sullivan	20	
Burlington Northern	107	
"	300	
"	40	
Alderson	150	
Columbia East	500	
Burlington Northern	315	
"	40	
"	75	
Hill	15	
USCE	10	

K. [unclear]  
 7-11-87  
 B. [unclear]  
 -87  
 ↓

Standard Oil	.75
Minnahan	40
Cohn Mut Life Ins	137
Tippett	135
"	160
Cohn Mut Life Ins.	160
Worsham	157
Cox	157
"	5
Cohn Mut Life Ins	130
"	155
Worsham	157
Burlington Northern	480
WA ST DNR	520
Columbia East	130
Burlington Northern	130
Seattle Hardware	4
Clase	1
Modd	2
Fanning	7
Frontier Machinery	12.5
Pasco, City of	15
Columbia	268
Dietrich	38
Tomlinson	345
Palomarez	26
Burden	20
Eastern Wa ID	5
Spooner	1
Reisinger	2

Hachman  
 7-17-87

Reisinger	6.5	9 ↓
Mann	10	
Johnson	5.5	
Lourdes	1.5	
Pasco, City of	10	
Pasco, Port of	3	
Columbia East	495	
Story Hill	73	
USCE	20	
	<u>100</u>	

Total 9879.75 acres  
 $\times 1.5$  people per acre  
14820 people

[Signature]  
 7-17-87



## SURFACE WATER ROUTE

### 1. OBSERVED RELEASE

#### 1a. Contaminants Detected in the Surface Water at the Facility or Down Gradient from It (5 maximum)

No observed release.

- Rationale for attributing contaminants to the facility:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\*\*\*\*\*

### 2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

#### 2a. Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

- Average slope of facility/site in percent:

The site is relatively flat (less than 1%).

- Name description of nearest down-slope surface water:

The only down slope water within two miles is a man-made dairy pond.

- Average slope of terrain between facility and above-cited surface water body in percent:

The average slope is less than 1%.

- Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?  
Yes / No (circle one)

- Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of higher elevation?  
Yes / No (circle one)

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1,12,13)

#### 2b. 1-Year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches

Less than 0.75

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 2 )

*[Handwritten signature]*  
7-17-87

2c. Distance to Nearest Down-slope Surface Water

The man-made dairy pond is approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the site. No natural water is located within two miles of the site.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1,12,13,  
15,16)

2d. Physical State of Substance at Time of Disposal

No known waste is available to surface water migration.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

\* \* \* \* \*

3. CONTAINMENT

3a. Containment

- Method(s) of waste or leachate containment:

All known hazardous wastes have been covered,

- Method with highest score:

All known hazardous wastes are covered with three feet of soil, four mil polyethylene sheeting, and capped with an additional two feet of soil.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

\* \* \* \* \*

4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

4a. Toxicity and Persistence

- Compound(s) evaluated:

Compound	Toxicity	Persistence	Total

*Handwritten signature*  
2-17-87

- Compound(s) with highest score:

No known compounds are available to migration.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

4b. Hazardous Waste Quantity

- Total amount of hazardous substance at the facility/site, excluding those with a containment score of zero. (Give a reasonable estimate, even if the quantity is above maximum.):

No known waste is available to surface water migration.

- Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity (must be documented and not assumed):

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

\*\*\*\*\*

5. TARGETS

5a. Surface Water Uses

- Use(s) of surface water within 3-miles downstream of the hazardous substance:

No natural surface water is used within two miles of the site and no known hazardous wastes are available to migration.

- Is there tidal influence? Yes / No (circle one)

HRS Section Score: (Ref. 1 )

5b. Distance to Sensitive Environment

- Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetland, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:
- Distance to critical habitat of federal endangered species or national wildlife refuge, if 1 mile or less:

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1

*[Handwritten signature]*  
7-17-87

5c. Population Served by Surface Water

- Location(s) of water-supply intake(s) within 3 miles (free-flowing bodies) or 1 mile (static bodies) downstream of the hazardous substance and population served by each intake:

No known wastes are available to surface water. No natural surface water is located within two miles of the site.

- Compute land area irrigated by above-cited intake(s) and convert to population (1.5 people per acre):
- Total population served: 0
- Name and description of nearest above-cited water bodies:
- Distance from probable point of entry to above-cited intakes (stream miles):

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1,12,13,  
15,16)

\* \* \* \* \*

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-07

## AIR ROUTE

### 1. OBSERVED RELEASE

#### 1a. Contaminants Detected in Ambient Air

None observed.

- Date and location of detection of contaminants:
- Method used to detect contaminants:
- Rationale for attributing contaminants to the site:

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1,15 )

\* \* \* \* \*

### 2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

#### 2a. Reactivity and Incompatibility

- Most reactive compound:
- Most incompatible pair of compounds:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

#### 2b. Toxicity

- Most toxic compound:

Compound	Toxicity

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

#### 2c. Hazardous Waste Quantity

- Total quantity of hazardous waste at the facility/site:

*[Handwritten signature]*  
7-17-87

- Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\* \* \* \* \*

### 3. TARGETS

#### 3a. Population Within 4-mile Radius

- Enter data under respective radius and indicate how determined:

0 to 4 miles	0 to 1 mile	0 to 1/2 mile	0 to 1/4 mile

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

#### 3b. Distance to Sensitive Environment

- Distance to 5-acre (minimum) coastal wetlands, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to 5-acre (minimum) fresh-water wetland, if 1 mile or less:
- Distance to critical habitat of an endangered species, if 1 mile or less:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

#### 3c. Land Use

- Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:
- Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 1 mile or less:

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87

- Distance to prime agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 2 miles or less:
- Is a historic or landmark site (National Register of Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87

## FIRE AND EXPLOSION

### FIRE MARSHAL'S STATEMENT:

This site poses no fire/explosive potential (Ref. 16).

#### 1. CONTAINMENT

- Hazardous substance present:
- Type of containment, if applicable:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\* \* \* \* \*

#### 2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

##### 2a. Direct Evidence

- Type of Instrument and Measurement:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

##### 2b. Ignitability

- Compound considered:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

##### 2c. Reactivity

- Most reactive compound:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

##### 2d. Incompatibility

- Most incompatible pair of compounds:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

*Handwritten signature*  
7-17-87



2e. Hazardous Waste Quantity

- Total quantity of hazardous substance(s) at the facility/site:
- Basis for estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\* \* \* \* \*

3. TARGETS

3a. Distance to Nearest Population

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

3b. Distance to Nearest Building

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

3c. Distance to Nearest Sensitive Environment

- Distance to wetlands:
- Distance to critical habitat:

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

3d. Land Use

- Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:
- Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife refuge, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:
- Distance to agricultural land in production within past 5 years, if 1 mile or less:

*[Handwritten signature]*  
7-17-87

- Distance to prime agricultural land in production within past 5 years,  
if 2 miles or less:

- Is a historic or landmark site within view of the site?  
Yes / No (circle one)

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

3e. Population Within 2-Mile Radius

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

3f. Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

*[Handwritten signature]*  
7-17-87

DIRECT CONTACT

1. OBSERVED INCIDENT

1a. Date, Location, and Pertinent Details of Incident

No observed incident reported.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1,15 )

\* \* \* \* \*

2. ACCESSIBILITY

2a. Describe Type of Barrier(s)

Site is not fenced. However, the operator's residence is on site.

HRS Section Score: 1 (Ref. 17 )

\* \* \* \* \*

3. CONTAINMENT

3a. Type of Containment, if Applicable

The known hazardous waste is covered with three feet of soil, four mil polyethylene sheeting, and capped with an additional two feet of soil.

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

\* \* \* \* \*

4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

4a. Toxicity

- Compounds evaluated:

<u>Compound</u>	<u>Toxicity</u>
No compounds available for contact.	

- Compound with highest score:

HRS Section Score: 0 (Ref. 1 )

*Handwritten signature and date:*  
7.17-87

\*\*\*\*\*

5. TARGETS

5a. Population Within 1-mile Radius of Site

No compounds available for contact.

HRS Section Score: (Ref. 1 )

5b. Distance to Critical Habitat (of Endangered Species)

HRS Section Score: (Ref. )

\*\*\*\*\*

*K. Michael D. Bialal*  
7-17-87

## REFERENCES

1. Ecology and Environment, Inc., June 1986. Final Report for Resource Recovery Corporation, Pasco, Washington.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 1984, Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Site Ranking System, A User's Manual. 47FR 31220-31241.
3. Kimberly Jr., John R., President, Resource Recovery Corporation, July 2, 1980. Letter to Department of Ecology.
4. Washington Department of Ecology, Dec. 1973. Industrial Waste Disposal Site Evaluation.
5. Resource Recovery Corporation, June 11, 1973 to January 17, 1975, Monthly Waste Summaries to Washington Department of Ecology.
6. Personal Communication, May 27, 1987. Pat Barttels, City of Pasco Engineering Department, Engineering Technician, to Charles F. Pitz, E&E, Seattle.
7. Washington State Well Logs.
8. State of Washington Public Water Supply System Listing.
9. Washington State Water Rights Data.
10. U.S. Geological Survey Well Records.
11. Washington State Well Log for John Dietrich's Well located at SW 1/4, NW 1/4, Sec. 22, T9N, R30E.
12. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), 1964. Pasco, Washington, Quadrangle Map, 7.5 Minute Series, Photo Revised 1973.
13. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)), 1979. Glade, Washington Quadrangle Map, 7.5 Minute Series.
14. Personal Communication, May 28, 1987. Cindy Christian, Washington Department of Ecology, Eastern District Office, to Charles F. Pitz, E&E, Seattle.
15. Personal Communication, May 29, 1987. Jean Tomlinson to Gloria Skinner, E&E, Seattle.
16. Personal Communication, June 1, 1987. Don Carter, Franklin County Fire Marshall to Gloria Skinner, E&E, Seattle.
17. Ecology and Environment, Inc., January 1985. Preliminary Site Inspection Report of Resource Recovery Corporation, Pasco, Washington.
18. Personal Communication with Richard Heinemeyer, 7/17/87

*Handwritten signature and date:*  
7-17-87